DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 693 SP 032 271

AUTHOR	Adler, Susan A.
TITLE	The Reflective Practitioner and the Curriculum of Teacher Education.
PUB DATE	Feb 90
NOTE	29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (Las Vegas, NV, February 5-8, 1990).
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cognitive Style; *Conceptual Tempo; *Critical Thinking; *Decision Making; Higher Education; *Inquiry; Preservice Teacher Education; Problem Solving; *Teacher Education Curriculum; Teaching Methods; Thinking Skills
IDENTIFIERS	Reflective Teaching

ABSTRACT

In this paper three different meanings ascribed to reflective teaching are examined. The first, Cruikshank's Reflective Teaching Model, sees reflective teaching as the ability to analyze one's own teaching practices. Schon's "Reflection in Action," on the other hand, argues that the professional practitioner is one who can think while acting and thus respond to the uncertainty, uniqueness, and conflict involved in the situations in which professionals practice. The third perspective toward reflective teacher education, the work of Zeichner, posits three levels of reflection: technical elements, situational and institutional contexts, and moral and ethical issues. The three models are described and compared, with references to other studies and theories on reflection. Teaching strategies intended to facilitate the development of reflection are discussed. These strategies are seen as ways to promote critical inquiry among preservice teachers. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED319693

THE REFLECTIVE PRACTITIONER AND THE CURRICULUM OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Susan A. Adler
University of Missouri - Kansas City
Kansas City, MO 64110

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Las Vegas NV, February, 1990.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Adler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP 032 271

THE REFLECTIVE PRACTITIONER AND THE CURRICULUM OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Over the past decade, the concept of the reflective practitioner has permeated the discourse[1] of teacher education. The arguments made for educating teachers to be reflective in their practice are not, of course, new ones. In 1904 John Dewey noted that:

> Practical work should be pursued primarily with reference to its reaction on the professional pupil, making him a thoughtful and alert student of education, rather than help him get immediate proficiency. For immediate skills may be got at the cost of the power to keep on growing.

But although Dewey's arguments are cited by teacher educators today, his ideas have not consistently been a part of the dominant discourse on teacher education in the twentieth century. Teacher preparation has more commonly focused on teacher behavior; that is, training teachers in procedures that have been determined to achieve particular ends (see, for example, Competency Based Teacher Education). From this perspective, appropriate, effective, teacher behavior, should be determined through empirical study. Rules and procedures based upon research are to be passed on to teachers and preservice teachers.

Today, however, Competency Based Teacher Education has been replaced, at least in the journals, by discussions about educating the reflective practitioner. Is it merely the label

which has changed, or something very real? And whether label or substance, why the change and what might it mean for the practice of teacher education? In examining this change, it must be remembered that, like schooling itself, the practices and theories of teacher education are not simply neutral, empirically derived truths. Rather, they are political statements which represent images, often competing ones, our society holds of schools generally and of the occupation of teaching more specifically.

A behavioral, or competency-based, approach to the education of teachers developed within the context of the expectations and values of twentieth century industrial society. Just as scientific management influenced the nature of work in business and industry, so too did it influence the nature of work for teachers and students in schools (Kliebard, 1987). Advocates of scientific management argued the need to break down tasks into small component parts and train workers to perform those parts in the most efficient way possible.

Teacher educators adopted ideas from scientific management and from the developing social sciences. Research on teaching and learning came to be seen as an excellent way to objectively identify traits and tasks of an effective teacher. Prospective teachers would then be taught to perform those tasks and develop those traits. This utilitarian perspective, as many have come to call it, is dominated by the image of the effective teacher as

one who performs particular tasks with expertise. Teacher education came to be understood as training in those tasks.

In recent years, a shift in both the image of teachers' work and the task of teacher education appears to have occurred. The classroom has come to be viewed as a complex social setting and the teacher as one who must make on the spot decisions in the application of learned skills. As Dewey argued early in the century, it is not enough to train teachers in effective practices, they must be helped to develop attitudes and habits of mind which will enable them to be more thoughtful about their practice. Teacher as decision-maker has entered the discourse of teacher education and apparent agreement on the need to prepare teachers to be reflective practitioners has emerged. On the surface, at least, the idea of the teacher as a reflective practitioner brings an added dimension to the tasks of teacher education. While the image of the reflective practitioner does not argue against technical proficiency, it does suggest that simply knowing how to do something is not enough.

However, beneath the apparent agreement suggested by the phrase reflective practitioner lies a great diversity of meaning and vision; an examination of meaning, or meanings is, therefore, in order. It is this diversity which is explored in this paper.

Discourses of Reflection

Reflection has become the code word, the slogan of teacher education (Apple 1986). Slogans serve to incite enthusiasm, to achieve a unity of feeling and purpose (Popkewitz, 1987). As a slogan, the phrase "educating the reflective practitioner" serves to convey an image of reform, an image of change that teacher educators can rally around. Slogans also mask a great diversity of practice and intent. To understand what is meant by "reflective practice" it is necessary to go beyond the phrase itself, to the patterns of discourse which underlie it.

Discourse refers to the exchange of ideas, an exchange shaped by rules which guide and frame arguments and expressions. Those rules, in turn, are bounded by contexts of time and place (Cherryholmes, 1988). Discourse is embodied in the language we use, but discourse is more than words. It is also embedded in patterns of behavior and practices of institutions (Smith & Zantiotis, 1988, p.100) To speak of the discourse of teacher education is to refer to the language found in texts, in journal articles, and in classrooms. It is also embodied in the practices of teacher education. To understand the phrase, we must scrutinize the stated theories, intentions and described practices of reflective teaching. In doing so, I have found at least three very different sets of meanings ascribed to reflection; it is to these meanings that I now turn.

Cruikshank's Reflective Teaching

In the model developed by Donald Cruikshank at Ohio State University, reflective teaching is the ability to analyze one's own teaching practice (Cruikshank, 1987). Cruikshank's model is intended to help preservice and inservice teachers become more reflective through structured laboratory experiences in which a designated "teacher" teaches a predetermined, "content-free," lesson to a small group of his or her peers. The designated teacher assesses the extent to which the learners have learned and, through discussions with the small group and in larger groups, considers the effectiveness of his or her teaching. In a summary of research on the effectiveness of the Cruikshank model, Peters (1985) indicates mixed results, but overall found that students were able to think and talk more reflectively. Reflection was measured by student responses to the completion of two sentence stems: "When I think about teaching...When I think about learning...."

Schon's "Reflection in Action"

Another influential model of the reflective practioner has been presented by Donald Schon of the Massachuesetts Institute of Technology. Schon (1983, 1987) argues that professional practice in this century has been guided by a technical rationality which defines such practice as the application of scientifically and rigorously developed rules and principles. He seeks to break

down this privileged status of scientific knowledge, in which the principles developed by researchers are passed on to practioners. He argues that, instead, we ought to look to the "competency and artistry already embedded in skillful practice (Schon, 1987, p.xi)." Schon defines the reflective practitioner as one who can think while acting and thus can respond to the uncertainty, uniqueness and conflict involved in the situations in which professionals practice.

Central to Schon's arguments are the concepts of "tacit knowledge," "knowing in action," and "reflection in action." "Knowledge-in-action" is the knowledge of practice developed by the experienced, skilled professional; such knowledge is generally tacit. "We reveal it by our spontaneous, skillful application of the performance; and we are characteristically unable to make it verbally explicit (Schon, 1987, p. 25). However, through observation and reflection, one can come to describe this knowledge. Thus knowledge-in-action is constructed, or reconstructed, from practice; furthermore, it is dynamic and situational, not easily reduced to rules and procedures. "Reflection-in-action" goes one step further. Such reflection allows the professional to respond to the variables of the immediate context; it involves thinking while "in the thick of things," or "thinking on one's feet." Crucial to this, is the ability to recognize the problematic, to "name" the things which will be attended to and to "frame" the context in which we will attend to them (Schon, 1983, p.40). Problem

setting, as Schon labels this process, thus becomes central to reflection.

Educating the reflective practitioner, then, must emphasize learning by doing and coaching. To accomplish this, Schon proposes the reflective practicum in which dialogue among students and between coach and students is fostered in order to promote proficiency in "reflection-in-action." In the practicum, students are involved in experiences that simulate practice, but with the pressures, distractions and risks of the real world removed (Schon, 1987, p.37). Students learn to recognize competent practice, to build images of expertise and to think in the midst of acting. Professional knowledge, in the sense of propositional knowledge, is secondary; students learn by doing under the tutelege of experienced practitioners (Schon, 1987, p.16).

For Schon, then, reflection involves the reconstruction of experience, the ability to apprehend practice settings in problematic ways (Grimmet, 1988, p.13). The "knowledge base" of such reflection derives promarily from the practice of experienced experts and, most importantly, from one's own practice, under the guidance of an experienced practitioner. Much like the Cruikshank model, laboratory experience is crucial to this image of reflection; the practicum provides the opportunity to act, albeit in a relatively risk free environment, and to reflect on (and in) that action. Schon's model is less prescriptive, less packaged, than Cruikshank's; he writes not

only of teacher education, but of professional education generally. Indeed, one of the criticisms of Schon is that the criteria for reflection are not clearly delineated (Court, 1988).

Reflection as Critical Inquiry

The work of Ken Zeichner (see, for example, Zeichner 1981; Zeichner & Liston, 1987) represents a third perspective toward reflective teacher education. Zeichner does not dismiss technical proficiency, nor the need to respond to the specific situations of practice; he does, however, see a need to go beyond technique and immediate situations. Zeichner posits three levels of reflection (Zeichner & Liston, 1987). The first is the technical. At this level, the emphasis is on the efficient application of professional knowledge to given ends; goals and objectives are not a subject for scrutiny, nor are long range consequences. Teachers and perspective teachers need to learn to reflect upon the effectiveness of their teaching strategies: have the learners achieved the given set objectives?

A second level places teaching within its situational and institutional contexts. Teachers are expected to be able to reflect upon why certain choices of practice may be made. How are these choices constrained and influenced by institutional, social, and historical factors? What hidden curricula may be embedded in practices, in the norms of the institution? This level of reflection goes beyond questions of proficiency at

achieving particular ends toward a thoughtful examination of how contexts influence teaching and learning, and a consideration of the worth of competing educational goals.

A third level of reflection introduces moral and ethical issues. Thinking about teaching and learning at this level is guided by concerns for justice and equity. Reflection at this level asks that teachers become, in Henry Giroux's (1988) terms, "transformative intellectuals," who are capable of examining the ways in which schooling generally, and one's own teaching specifically, contribute or fail to contribute, to a just and humane society. It is expected that in reflection teachers would be able to transcend every day experience, to imagine things as they ought to be, not simply accept things as they are. And it is expected that such images would shape the teacher's practice and their thinking about their practice.

A Comparison of Models

These models described above share several characteristics. Each conceives of teaching as a complex activity, a process that is not highly predictable. Each has embedded in it the image of teachers as practitioners who are called upon to make informed, thoughtful decisions. Thus each is concerned with the problem of developing in teachers the ability to perceive and respond to particular contexts and situations in ways that will facilitate the development of informed judgment and skilled teaching.

Despite these similarities, however, there are important differences between these models.

Tom (1985) argued that inquiry oriented teacher education is a multi-faceted concept and that there are wide areas of disagreement among those who find themselves sharing this orientation. Tom proposed that the differences among inquiry-oriented teacher education proposals might be explored along three continua: the arena of the problematic, the model of inquiry and the ontological status of educational phenomenon. Using Tom's analysis can facilitate seeing distinctions among the models diccussed above.

The Cruikshank model of Reflective Teaching takes as the primary problematic a teacher's choice of teaching strategies; the content, context and goals of teaching remain unexamined. Questions of appropriate ends are not problematic; they are the givens of a teaching situation. The model of inquiry used stresses commonsense approaches to deriving knowledge about teaching. There is not necessarily a rigorous or analytic application of social science information, for example. Finally, the Cruikshank model does not depend upon the application of generalizations empirically developed by researchers. Rather, in the stress on ongoing classroom inquiry, this model implies, at least, that educational phenomonon are socially constructed (Tom, 1985, p. 42).

Further following Tom's analysis, Schon's model takes as its problematic the teaching context as well as practice. It does

not necessarily, as Schon describes it, question curriculum content or goals. The model of inquiry described by Schon stresses practitioner knowledge or "knowledge-in-action," not the analytic application of, for example, social science knowledge. Educational phenomona in this model, as in Cruikshank's, are conceived of as socially constructed.

To what extent are these two models of teacher education a significant change from the utilitarian discourse discussed above? Have we a new model for preparing teachers or a reconstruction of the old? As the tone of my question no doubt suggests, I believe that what we have in the first two models is not unlike the utilitarian discourse described earlier, only clothed with new accessories. To understand what has changed and what remains the same, we must turn again to the wider streams of thought which influence thinking about schooling.

Our faith in the efficacy of the utilitarian discourse has been shaken by changes beyond the school and education research. Changing notions of the structure of workplaces, for example, have begun to change our image of the assembly line to one of the quality circle in which the workers' are encouraged to make decisions about how particular jobs might best be accomplished. Our confidence that social science will provide us with the knowledge of law-like generalizations about human behavior has been called into question. Human behavior has come increasingly to be seen as historically bounded while social interactions are

understood as far more complex than positivist empirical research allows for.

These ideas, of course, are not new; dominant discourses always exist with oppositional and alternative strands and may respond to critiques in several ways. One response is to ignore the criticisms, retaining dominance by assumption. Another response is to incorporate the criticisms into the dominant field achieving either a new synthesis or a redefinition of the old (Smith & Zantiotis, 1988). Recently, alternative views of, for example, research and the nature of the workplace have been incorporated into mainstream thinking.

Thus changing ideas from other work sites and from the academy itself have been incorporated into the dominant discourse of teacher education. The preservice teacher is no longer the merely passive recipient of the knowledge developed by research. Rather, the teacher is expected to assess his or her strategies in light of their effectiveness in classroom situations. The emphasis is on doing the job effectively, but, unlike the conception of reflection represented in the Zeichner model, what is problematic is teaching practice, the implementation of curriculum, not the goals embedded in the curriculum, or the school structure itself. Thus the image of the reflective practitioner, as it is conveyed by Cruikshank and by Schon, continues to be utilitarian; the image projected in the Zeichner model, on the other hand, projects a more transformative role for the teacher. Zeichner's reflective practitioner should develop

skills within existing contexts, but should also think critically about those contexts and their effects upon the human beings who function within them.

Strategies in Reflective Teacher Education

The implementation of any of the models described above depends upon the instructor and the program. That is, in observing or reading about strategies designed to promote reflective inquiry, it should by kept in mind that particular strategies are pieces of broader programs and subject to the skills and understandings of the individuals utilizing these strategies. Any of the models could incorporate an examination of curriculum goals, and of the social/cultural consequences of particular practices. However, neither Cruikshank nor Schon discuss the need for these concerns. Similarly, advocates of the Zeichner model may not always focus on questions involving social issues or on questions of equity and justice. Further, intentions to do so will not always be successful.

What follows is an overview of strategies described in recent literature with an indication of the model to which it seems to fit most appropriately. While it is possible to so categorize particular strategies, we cannot do so with much certainty without further information about both actual implementation and broader goals.

Reflective Teaching

Cruikshank's Reflective Teaching is a particular strategy and is well described in the literature (see, for example,

Cruikshank, 1987). As depicted above, this strategy involves teaching preconceived topics to a small group of one's peers, assessing their learning and then discussing the teaching effectiveness both with the small group and with the larger class.

Problematizing the Situation

There are a variety of strategies described in the literature which are consistent with Schon's goal of helping pratitioners learn to problematize the particular teaching situation. As noted above, Schon advocates the Reflective Seminar and stresses the importance of the dialogue between mentor and student.

Other strategies may also serve this end. Lucas (1988) described a strategy in which teachers engaged collaboratively in defining and solving a problem related to teaching and learning. Each group had to submit a report to their department and to the methods' instructor. Each also had to make a presentation to teachers from the schools engaged in collaborative inquiry projects, thus the report was not just another assignment, but had real audience as well.

Korthagen (1985) describes a series of activities designed to promote reflection among preservice teachers. He advocates a gradual approach; that is, helping students learn to reflect in a series of steps, beginning first with assignments that are short and simple. He, as others who will be discussed, also argues

that reflection has to begin by getting students to think about themselves and their own experiences. Students are asked to consider how they learn best, to think about their communication styles, to consider their own goals. They should be prompted to reflect about teaching they themselves experience as students. For example, he may ask students to consider how they feel about helping and being helped in small group work. He advocates having students keep a log as they work in the field. As will become evident, many of his strategies are echoed by others and can be implemented in ways that stimulate reflection at a variety of levels.

The case study approach as described by Hill (1986) can also be implemented to promote reflection at a variety of levels. Hill has her preservice elementary teachers do in indepth study of the language development of one child. The students' interactions with their particular child provide the concrete experiences for reflection. A log in which students write their reactions, frustrations, discoveries serves as a vehicle for reflection. A seminar allows students to share these thoughts and provides a forum for group analysis and problem solving. Through dialoque in the seminar, students are encouraged to explore and call into question their tacit assumptions. Open-mindedness is encouraged.

These strategies may each be used to help students "problematize" their teaching situations, to stimulate students

out of the routine application of teaching strategies. They may or may not involve reflection on ethical issues.

Critical Inquiry

Interestingly, most of the teaching strategies I found in the teacher education literature of the last decade appear to emphasize strategies which are intended to facilitate the development of reflection on all three levels posited by Zeichner.[2] The strategies discussed below are each seen by the authors as ways to promote a critical inquiry among preservice teachers. Before reviewing these strategies, a greater understanding of the Zeichner model may be in order.

Critical inquiry, as Zeichner, and those who cite Zeichner, see it, involves questioning that which is otherwise taken for granted. It involves looking for unarticulated assumptions and seeing from new perspectives. The area of the problematic moves beyond the immediate situation into an awareness of ethical and political possibilities. It involves learning to make decisions about teaching and learning based upon perceived ethical and political consequences and an awareness of alternatives. The pedagogy utilized to promote critical inquiry must be designed to encourage students to question, analyze and consider alternatives within an ethical, political framework.

The pedagogy discussed below provides an overview of teaching strategies for reflective inquiry. Some authors present only a very general set of characteristics of critical pedagogy;

others present one or more specific strategies. In general, the specific strategies serve as a nice complement to the more general prescriptions, presenting teacher educators with concrete images of how to implement a critical pedagogy.

Generic characteristics. Critical pedagogy must begin with the pre-existing beliefs of the prospective teachers (O'Loughlin & Campbell, 1988). Critical discourse is necessary to help students examine their personal theories of action as well as the theories they learn in their professional course work (Ross & Hannay, 1986). The commonsensical needs to be seen as problematic and knowledge is to be understood as socially constructed (Beyer, 1984). Critical inquiry, making connections between the daily routines and the complex issues of society, must be incorporated into the students' beliefs systems if they are to carry it with them into their teaching practices.

Students must be sensitized to the social-cultural and personal consequences of accepted, ordinary practices; they must be challenged to examine moral and professional ambiguities (Farber, Wilson & Holm, 1989) and helped to understand that school practices are inextricably intertwined with social, political and economic exigencies (Beyer, 1984). Laird (1988) argues for the importance of analyzing, questioning and reconstructing the very definition of teaching. In doing so, she argues for the appropriateness of using a "feminist pedagogy" in which a the members of a community of learners are empowered

to act responsibly toward one another and toward the subject matter and to apply that learning to social action (Laird, 1988, p. 450).

Steps in inquiry. At a slightly less general level are descriptions of steps that students might undergo in the development of the skills, habits and attitudes of inquiry. Smyth (1989) discusses the importance of helping teachers and prospective teachers develop a "sense of agency," a sense that they can become challengers who take initiative. To do this, Smyth writes that teacher educators must find ways to allow students to focus on every day concerns while at the same time distancing themselves. To do so, Smyth suggests a four stage activity which would involve first having students write a narrative of a confusing, perplexing situation. From description, students then would be helped to uncover their implicit theories and begin to understand why they operate as they do. From there, students are to be helped to confront their operational theories, to call them into question by locating them in the broader social, cultural and political contexts. Students are asked to reevaluate taken-for-granted notions and constructed mythologies. The forth stage is one of reconstructing, to gain sufficent control of self and contexts to consider alternative actions and how they might be undertaken.

Autobiography and ethnography. Consistent with the understanding that critical inquiry must begin with an examination of one's own

heretofore own unexamined assumptions, Grumet (1989) argues for the use of autobiography and autobiographical studies in teacher education. Autobiography can be used to help students move back and forth between their experiences and the information they are learning. More important, it helps them consider how personal stories differ and why, to see that there are multiple stories and to understand why that is, and to question the unexamined in their own lives. "Autobiographical writing invites those who would teach to recover the world within which they came to be knowing subjects (Grumet, 1989, p.15)."

Gitlin & Teitlebaum (1983) argue for the use of ethnography to help preservice teachers reflect upon schooling practices. The authors argue that by helping students to systematically observe school practices, to step back from their observations and utilize relevant knowledge to understand what has been observed, and to present these conclusions in a coherent form, helps them to become aware of the influences of hiddem curriculum, to examine the limits on schooling practice and to make judgments, using ethical criteria, on the legitimacy of those practices.

Methods classes. Adler & Goodman (1986) describe strategies used in a social studeies methods class to help students develop skills of critical inquiry. They describe a series of activities they have students participate in during the first part of the semester. First, students are asked to reexamine their own

schooling experiences. Second, they are asked to consider what social studies ought to be. Third, through interviews, textbook analyses, and school observations, they are to describe social studies as it presently exists in schools and then compare that to the imagine developed earlier. The final step has students synthesize their personal knowledge with ideas gathered from other class members and readings. During the second segment of the class students are taught a critical approach to designing curriculum.

Goodman (1986) expands on the strategy of taking a critical approach to curriculum development. Prospective teachers are encouraged to see themselves as creators of curriculum. In choosing a topic on which to write curriculum, students are asked to consider what is important for learners and why somethings matter. They are expected to explore diverse resources in order to move beyond the textbook as the primary teaching tool, and to find innovative ways to discover what learners are learning. Students are encouraged to develop strategies in which learners will be expected to use imagination, speculation, intuition and analysis.

Adler (in press) presents the strategy of using imaginative literature in teacher education programs generally and the social studies methods class specifically. Adler argues that imaginative literature can be used to engage in students in inquiry into the nature of social studies, of teaching social

studies and into their personal knowledge and assumptions about social studies related subjects.

Field experiences and supervision. Field based experiences provide a natural basis for inquiry; it is not surprising, then, that a number of strategies for promoting critical inquiry among preservice teachers are focused on early field experiences, student teaching, and the seminars and supervision that are likely to accompany these experiences. In their description of the University of Wisconsin student teaching experience for elementary school preservice teachers, Zeichner & Liston delineate several strategies used to promote critical reflection.

First, the student teachers are expected to assume an active role in curriculum development, not simply implement ideas and goals developed by others. Second, they are each required to do a project which will involve them in inquiry: action-research, ethnography, or curriculum analysis. In addition, each student is expected to keep a journal which is to serve as a vehicle for reflective analysis. Both supervision and the student teacher seminar are seen as crucial components of promoting reflective inquiry. "The seminar is designed to help students broaden their perspectives on teaching, consider the rationales underlying alternative possibilities for classrooms and pedagogy, and assess their own developing perspectives toward teaching (p.32)." The supervisory conference provides an opportunity for supervisors to relate the general issues discussed in seminars, such as hidden curriculum, the institutional contexts of teaching, and the

nature of curriculum goals, to the particular experiences of the student teachers. In all of these activities, students are expected to consider latent and long-range effects of schooling practices and to examine their own assumptions and socialization (Zeichner, 1981).

Gitlin (1984) highlights the potential importance of the role of the supervisor in helping the students teacher to reflect. Rather than focusing simply or solely on observed behavior, the supervisor can serve to help clarify the relationships between the student teacher's short term and long term intentions and observed practice. In addition, the supervisor can help the student teacher think through and evaluate the short and long term intents which guide teaching.

Ashcroft & Griffiths (1989) similarly argue that supervisors must serve as facilitators and questioners, in symmetrical relationships with students teachers, rather than simply imparters of knowledge and judgments.

Can reflection really be taught?

Those who advocate the development of reflective inquiry in preservice teachers are well aware of the difficulties involved in doing so. Preservice teachers are often very focused on learning the "best" way and become impatient with inquiry oriented activities (see, for example, Adler & Goodman, 1986). Even students who are more natuarally responsive to the demands of inquiry are likely to feel severely constrained by the

dominant discourse of management they probably find in their student teaching sites (Kickbusch, 1987) and in their university programs (Beyer, 1989). Wildman and Niles (1987) point put the difficulties in actually developing skills of analysis and in expecting teachers to actually be able to implement these skills in contemporary school contexts.

There is little empirical evidence, beyond the impressions of authors, that these strategies really do promote critical inquiry. As Zeichner noted (1987) there is a need to move beyond impressionistic studies and to more systematically investigate educating the reflective practitioner. We would do well not to look for the "one best way," a strategy or set of strategies that work well with all students at all times and in all contexts. However, this should not prevent us from asking about the impacts of these various strategies on various teacher education students both in the short run and in the long run. Is it possible to promote reflective inquiry and at what level? If yes, what is the impact of reflection on teaching practice, on learning, and on relationships with all those involved in the schooling process? Given the attraction of the image of the reflective teacher, we need to ask not only "what do we mean," but also "what are the consequences."

1. I use the term discourse to refer to the orderly exchange of ideas, an exchange bounded by agreed upon rules. Discourses of teacher education are embodied in journals, texts and in the practices in programs as well (see Cherryholmes, 1988).

2.This preponderence of literature on strategies for multiple levels of reflection or the development of critical inquiry, does not necessarily reflect dominant practices in teacher education

programs. More likely it reflects the dominant, or aspired toward practices of those teacher educators who also publish; this is a small segment of the general pool of teacher educators.

REFERENCES

Adler, S. (in press). "Forming a critical pedagogy for the social studies methods class: The use of imaginative literature." In B.R. Tabachnick & K.M. Zeichner (Eds.) Practices and issues in inquiry oriented teacher education. London: Falmer Press.

Adler, S. & Goodman, J (1986). "Critical theory as a foundation for methods courses." Journal of Teacher Education, 37(4), 2-8.

Apple, M.W. (1986). Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Beyer, L.E. (1984). "Field experience, ideology, and the development of critical reflectivity." Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), 36-41.

Beyer, L.E. (1989) "Reconceptualizing teacher education: Institutions and ideologies." Journal of Teacher Education, 40(1), 22-26.

Cherryholmes, C.H. (1988). Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Court, D. (1988). "'Reflection-in-action': Some definitional problems." In P.P. Grimmett and G.L. Erickson (Eds), Reflection in teacher education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cruikshank, D.R. (1987). Reflective teaching: The preparation of students of teaching. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Dewey, J. (1904/1964). "The relation of theory to practice in education." In R.D. Archambault (Ed.), John Dewey on Education (pp. 313-318). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Farber, P., Wilson, P. & Holm, G. (1989). "From innocence to inquiry: A social reproduction framework." Journal of Teacher Education, 40(1), 45-50.

Giroux, H.A. (1988). "Teachers as transformative intellectuals." In H.A. Giroux, Teachers as Intellectuals,(ch.9), Mass: Bergin & Garvin Publishers.

Gitlin, A. (and others)(1984). "Supervision, reflection, and understanding: A case for horizontal evaluation." Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), 46-52.

Gitlin, A. & Teitlebaum, K. (1983). Linking theory and practice: The use of ethnographic methodology by prospective teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 9(3), 225-234.

Goodman, J. (1986). Teaching preservice teachers a critical approach to curriculum design: A descriptive account." Curriculum Inquiry, 16(2), 179-201.

Grimmett, P.P. (1988). "The nature of reflection and Schon's conception in perspective." In P.P. Grimmett and G.L. Erickson (Eds), Reflection in teacher education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Grumet, M.R. (1989). "Generations: Reconceptualist curriculum theory and teacher education." Journal of Teacher Education, 40 (1), 13-17.

Hill, S (1986). "Language education and field experiences." Journal of Teacher Education, 37(3), 56-59.

Kickbusch, K.W. (1987). "Civic education and preservice educators: Extending the boundaries of discourse." Theory and Research in Social Education, 15(3), 173-188.

Kliebard, H. (1987). The struggle for the American curriculum: 1893-1959. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Korthagen, F.A. (1985). "Refelective teaching and preservice teacher education in the Netherlands." Journal of Teacher Education, 36(5), 11-15.

Laird, S. (1988). "Reforming 'women's true profession': A case for 'feminist pedagogy' in teacher education. Harvard Educational Review, 58(4), 449-463.

Lucas,P. (1988). An approach to research based teacher education through collaborative inquiry." Journal of Education for Teaching, 14(1), 55-73.

O'Loughlin, M. & Campbell, M.B. (1988). "Teacher preparation, teacher empowerment and reflective inquiry:A critical perspective." Teacher Education Quarterly, 15(4), 25-53.

Peters, J. (1985). "Research on reflective teaching: A form of laboratory teaching experience." Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18(3), 55-62.

Popkewitz, T.S. (1984). Paradigm and ideology in educational research: The social functions of the intellectual. London: Falmer Press.

Popkewitz, T.S. (1987). "Ideology and social formation in teacher education." In T. Popkewitz (Ed), Critical Studies in Teacher Education: Its Folklore, Theory and Practice (pp 2-34). London: Falmer Press.

Ross, E.W. & Hannay, L.M. (1986). "Towards a critical theory of reflective inquiry." Journal of Teacher Education, 37(4), 9-15.

Schon, D.A. (1983) The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Schon, D. A. (1987). Educating the reflective practioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, R. & Zantiotis, A. (1988). "Practical teacher education and the avant garde." Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 8(2), 77-106.

Smyth, John (1989). "Developing and sustaining critical reflection in teacher education." Journal of Teacher Education, 40(2), 2-9.

Tom, A (1985). "Inquiring into inquiry-oriented teacher-education." Journal of Teacher Education, 36(5), 35-44.

Wildman, T.M. & Niles, J.A. (1987). "Refelective teachers: Tensions between abstractions and realities." Journal of Teacher Education, 38(4), 25-31.

Zeichner, K.M. (1981). "Reflective teaching and field based experience." Interchange, 12(4), 1-22.

Zeichner, K.M. (1983). "Alternative paradigms of teacher education." Journal of Teacher Education, 34(3).

Zeichner, K.M. & Liston, D.P. (1987). "Teaching student teachers to reflect." Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 23-48.